McCarthy's Attack on CIA, P. 2

Morse Warns Against Plan to Hide Military Aid Next Year in Pentagon Budget, See Page 3

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XII, NO. 2 JANUARY 13, 1964 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Why Moscow's Peace Proposal Was Labelled "Disappointing"

In a message to Premier Khrushchev on New Year's Day, President Johnson called on the Soviet leader to make 1964 a year in which we take further steps "toward peace." Next day the Soviet Premier sent a note to all world capitals urging renunciation of force in the settlement of territorial disputes. This has brought the standard cold war reaction from the State Department, which describes the note as "disappointing." As usual American public opinion is being formed, not by a study of the document itself, but by the headlines generated in hasty briefings at the State Department. "U.S. Finds Little New in K's Note," said a typical headline in the *Washington Post* Jan. 4, "Officials Suspect 'Booby-Traps' in Moscow Proposal." This was followed Jan. 6 with an unusually inane "backgrounder" in which its diplomatic correspondent, after smoking hashish in the public relations dens of the Department, emerged with the self-congratulatory view that the Department has shrewdly changed its style, that it was now saying "no, but" instead of "no" in a devilishly clever maneuver "to avoid being cast in a negative anti-peace position." The State Department, the *Washington Post* reports, is determined "never to let the Soviet Union corner the issue of peace." The anxiety is not about peace, but the fear of losing a propaganda battle.

Why Is Bonn So Nervous?

The Soviet note was "disappointing" because Moscow got in ahead of Washington with the first concrete proposal of the New Year. It was "non-objective" because it did not look at the world the State Department's way. A better test of its objectivity may be obtained by freeing our minds from the barrage of propaganda let loose by State Department briefings and taking a fresh look for ourselves. The Soviet note is ably written and moderately phrased and it puts its finger on a major problem, that of territorial disputes. The first observation to be made is that the Soviet proposal is no different in principle from the proposal we have ourselves made the prime condition of negotiation with Communist China, that it renounce the use of force to recover Formosa. Renunciation of force, we have been telling Peking for several years, does not mean renunciation of claims, but only their peaceful negotiation. We like this in the Far East where our nuclear armed 7th fleet commands the Formosa straits. But we and our principal allies the Germans don't like it in Europe where the latter still hope that a nuclear armed Germany by threat of force will yet be able to recover the Eastern territories lost to Russia and Poland in the last war. Indeed the immediate reaction from Bonn was that the Soviet note was intended to block its declared ambition to recover the boundaries of 1937. But if, as the Germans have said, they intend only to do this peacefully by negotiation, why do they respond so nervously to a proposal that force be renounced?

Of course the Communist like the capitalist world is inconsistent. Each side likes renunciation of force where it suits its purpose, as each side likes free elections where it can win. They're for free elections in Vietnam and we're for free elections in Germany, just as we're for renunciation of force over Formosa but not over Germany. They would make Formosa an exception to their general formula, as historically a part

(Continued on Page Four)

De Gaulle as Peace Maker

Both big powers talk peace, but if you look closely you will see that France really practices it. An independent world peace policy as well as an independent nuclear deterrent is being created by de Gaulle. We note some significant year-end items.

For all practical purposes Moscow and Washington are united in a policy of isolating China. But an interview with Prime Minister Chou En-lai was telecast over the government owned TV station in France (text in Le Monde, Jan. 1) as part of a growing entente between Paris and Peking. This could lead to China's admission to the UN, since the French African states under de Gaulle's influence have enough votes to swing the balance in China's favor. Chou En-lai used the interview to deny that China was against peaceful coexistence and to state his complaints against the U.S.

A second item concerns Cuba. Last Dec. 4, Senator Keating protested offers of French economic aid to Castro; now Havana radio (New York Times, Jan. 4, Late City ed.) reports de Gaulle singled out the Cuban Ambassador at a New York reception in Paris for a talk in which he expressed sympathy for Cuba.

A third and well known item concerns the Far East, where both big powers are at a loss; there French diplomacy maintains Western influence in Cambodia and alone offers the hope of a healing peace in Vietnam.

The fourth item, which passed unnoticed in the press but not in governmental circles, was subtle and startling. In his New Year broadcast, in expressing the hope for a truly united Europe, which might include the Soviet States as their internal regimes liberalized, General de Gaulle mentioned among the Communist capitals the two black sheep, Moscow's outcast Tirana (capital of Albania) and the West's outcast Pankow (capital of East Germany). This unexpected and unusual courtesy to Ulbricht, coming from de Gaulle, the alley of West Germany, seemed almost a form of recognition. Since de Gaulle is also the only Western leader publicly to accept the Oder-Neisse line as final, this friendly reference to Pankow indicates that maverick initiatives on the German question by France are also possible. Perhaps de Gaulle can rescue this one, too, from the cold war's deep freeze.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Sen. McCarthy in Satevepost Discloses That Assassins Are on the CIA's Payroll

A Congressional Watchdog Committee Will Not End Cloak-and-Dagger Evils

The unintended are as important as the intended revelation in Senator Eugene McCarthy's "The CIA Is Getting Out of Hand" in the *Saturday Evening Post* (Jan. 4-11). He hints (see adjoining box) that the missile threat from Cuba was exaggerated. He puts the Bay of Pigs in perspective as an invasion by a secret agency of Congressional power to organize armies and to make war. He pictures the U-2 affair not as a blunder but as an incident by which the CIA, in upsetting the summit conference, made foreign policy. He protests the sinister process by which a supposed information gathering agency has been "taking over the roles of the State Department, Defense Department and Congress as well as carrying the nation to the edge of war." Most important of all, in discussing the growth of the CIA to the point where it employs 14,000 men and is one of the most powerful agencies in Washington, he reveals that hired killers are among its agents. It has on its payroll, he writes, "specialists in intelligence analysis and espionage, U-2 pilots *and assassins*" (our italics).

Any Means to Reach Our Ends?

But neither Senator McCarthy, nor the *Saturday Evening Post* in an editorial that same week on the President's assassination, seems to see that the employment of assassins by our own government is morally monstrous. Even that tragedy has not been enough to free them from the evil notion fostered by the cold war that our ends are so righteous that somehow any means to achieve them are justified. The Senator makes the conventional plea that the Cold War requires tactics the authors of the Constitution could hardly have imagined. It is time this stereotype were challenged. Assassination as a political weapon is as old as history; the enemy of the moment has always been the embodiment of Satan. The struggle for a civilized world, which had been going on long before 1789 much less 1947, was to impose law on international relations and bounds even on warfare, much less hostility in time of peace. The fact is that no other government but ours boasts of such an agency, and there is no evidence that any other government today employs assassins in carrying out its policies.

Cuban Missile Threat Exaggerated?

"A watchdog committee [to supervise the CIA] would also stop some irresponsible talk concerning U.S. activities abroad. The presence of Soviet missiles in Cuba 18 months after the Bay of Pigs invasion, for example, loosed a torrent of oratory on the magnitude of the Soviet threat in Cuba. If the CIA had briefed a watchdog committee certain inaccurate statements which stemmed from ignorance of the facts would never have been uttered."

—Sen. McCarthy on the CIA in Satevepost Jan. 4.

The remedy Senator McCarthy proposes is too mild for the disease. The CIA's director, John McCone, demonstrated when head of the AEC how easily he could twist a supposed watchdog, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to his purposes. In any case, to set up a Congressional committee to pass on requests for funds and permission to kill foreign leaders we dislike and overthrow foreign governments of which we disapprove would only be to institutionalize the evil and spread the corruption. Only by ending all cloak and dagger activities and reducing the CIA to normal intelligence tasks, as former President Truman suggests, can this cancerous growth be excised from a free society.

When Senator McCarthy discusses the Guatemala affair (see box below) he inadvertently discloses how dangerous it is to let a agency of our government, even if supervised, carry on secret war against other governments. Ignorance and unconscious arrogance are revealed in his easy assumption that the U.S. "undoubtedly benefitted" from the CIA's overthrow of Arbenz. The United Fruit Company, yes. But the USA? And even if we did benefit, have we the right to impose our views by force and stealth upon our neighbors against their wishes, to decide what is best for them, or if not for them, then at least for us?

A Liberal Senator But On Guatemala Far to The Right of Britain's Tories

"The CIA also claims to have masterminded the overthrow of the Communist-influenced government of Jacobo Arbenz Guzman in Guatemala in 1954. In this instance the result undoubtedly benefitted the United States, but the question remains as to whether the CIA is the proper tool for such endeavors."

—Sen. McCarthy (D. Minn.) in Sat. Eve. Post, Jan.4-11.

"A special problem was created [in Guatemala] by the extensive estates of the United Fruit Company . . . the parts of the Company's holdings lying fallow could, under the provisions of the [Arbenz Agrarian reform] law be legally forfeit. The Company argued that such unused reserves were temporarily necessitated by the technical considerations of banana production. Large tracts of its property, including some areas under cultivation, were nevertheless expropriated. Sharp diplomatic protests followed from the U.S., and the whole reform came to be regarded as an anti-U.S. act and a means of turning Guatemala into a Communist state. . . . Nearly one million hectares, including a large tract of United Fruit Company territory, were expropriated and divided up among 100,000 rural workers. . . . One of the first acts of the Government of Col. Castillo Armas, in 1954 [after Arbenz' overthrow], was to cancel the Agrarian Reform law and restore the status quo.

"In considering the abortive Arbenz reform, it may be asked to what extent its denunciation as a Communist menace was justified. The provisions of the law were by no means of an extreme revolutionary nature. The application of these measures was, however, in some cases revolutionary. The Communists clearly spared no effort to turn the situation to their advantage. Yet few cases of violence against landowners was reported, and no attempt seems to have been made to set up peasant collectives. . . . It is at least arguable that, if left to take its course, the reform would have worked out in much the same way as in Mexico and Bolivia."

—Agrarian Reform in Latin America, a pamphlet by Chatham House (the Royal Institute of International Affairs, the citadel of the Tory point of view toward colonial problems), Oxford Univ. Press (London and Fair Lawn, N.J.) Nov. 1962.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Summing Up Fallacies That Lead Us to Waste Billions in Foreign Aid

Morse Warns Against Plan to Hide Military Aid in Pentagon Budget

The recipients of our military aid cannot maintain large military establishments out of their own economic resources. If they could, they would not need the military aid from us. In that sense we are leaning on weak reeds wherever we send military aid, because a country that is militarily dependent on others in time of peace is hopelessly dependent upon others in time of war.

Take Iran. There is a country on the border of the Soviet Union to which we have sent $633 million in military aid between 1946 and 1963. We sent Iran $789 million in economic aid in the same period. But suppose some Soviet aggression occurred against Iran. Ignoring for the moment the purely military value—if any—of the Iranian forces, the U.S. would have to pour still more American wealth into Iran itself to keep it going under war conditions.

This Applies to Most of the Program

Exactly the same is true of Turkey, Taiwan, Pakistan, Greece, Korea, the Philippines, Thailand and South Vietnam, all of which account for the great bulk of foreign aid outside the Alliance for Progress.

We have heard repeated over and over again that it is cheaper to maintain in uniform a South Korean, a Formosan, a Pakistani, a Turk, when the fact is that we maintain them and our own forces as well; and it is our own forces, and not their military defense, that give them the security.

There is the ugly fact, which the world needs to face, that if war were to break out with Russia, it would not be a conventional war. All the billions of dollars of military aid that we have poured into these countries would be recognized as having been wasted. It would be a nuclear war of short duration and the probabilities are that both of the major combatants would destroy themselves.

The time has come for a hard, long look at military aid. I warn the American people what the next move will be. The next move will be a move of partial concealment, by taking military aid out of the general aid bill, and having it considered in connection with the U.S. defense budget. It does not belong there because it is a foreign policy issue.

Plans to separate economic aid from military aid will, if carried out, lead to increases in both. It has been commonly said for many years that Congress would approve just about any amount of military aid if it were hidden away in the budget of the Defense Department. There is a wide body of opinion in the administration that economic aid should be sacrificed, if need be, to the objections made to foreign aid in general, but that military aid should be put in the Defense Department budget where it will be rubber-stamped by Congress. But even if it is carried out, its proponents will find out eventually that the nations favored for even more military aid cannot make use of it without large sums of economic aid.

I am opposed to such separation for another reason. Putting military aid into the Defense Department budget in a effort to remove it from true Congressional scrutiny would be a final step in the direction of military diplomacy.

—Morse to the Senate Dec. 30 (abridged).

Why, Then, An Alliance for Progress?

"It is said both in Latin America and in the U.S. that if we expect these countries to move too fast and do very much to help themselves, they will become unsettled politically and that might lead to unsettled military consequences. This is why the apologies are made for the juntas in Latin America. The apology makes the case that reform upsets the ruling classes and causes them to seize the government. But if the same old system is to remain entrenched in Latin America, then I see no reason for the Alliance for Progress. If the juntas take over to prevent reform, and if the juntas are desirable because they keep the Communists down, then there is really no reason for any further American investment in the nations to the south."

—Morse of Oregon to the Senate, Dec. 30.

Three American Eye-Witnesses Protest The New Dictatorship in Dominican Republic

"Senator Morse, in the almost 2 months I spent in the Dominican Republic after the new dictatorship took over from Juan Bosch, I have seen with my own eyes thousands of people, on many occasions, tear- and nausea-gassed by the police. Students kicked and beaten, for trying to march or demonstrate, and in one case I watched a night high school student die with a bullet hole through his abdomen. The 'civilian junta' or triumvirate, as it is called in the now controlled news, is a military dictatorship, trying to impose control through terror."

"Last month I returned to the U.S. after two years in the Dominican Republic. Because I love the Dominican Republic and of course our country, I don't want to see either of them go wrong.

"1. Under the government of Juan Bosch there was complete freedom of movement, opinion, publication, expression. Law was enforced, and there was no cause for, nor interest in, rebellion.

"2. The leftover Trujillo military, in combination with the great hereditary rich, seized power on Sept. 25, 1963, and have enforced a new dictatorship.

"3. Pacific resistance by the people has failed. It appears that now on about 11 fronts there is fighting in the mountains and countryside. The triumvirate claims this is a Communist movement. Naturally they must, to excuse their suppression of it. One of the leaders of one of the fronts is 'Manolo' Tavarez, leader of the leftist '14th of June' party [since killed by the military—IFS].

"4. But the resistance is in truth universal and is being joined by upper and middle class and urban youth of the lower class, [who] represent all shades of political opinion."

"Last December [1962] hope had a beginning—for the first time in their lives, the campesinos' voice had some meaning, and their votes put a man in office. But the recent 'golpe de estado' [military coup] proved once again that the wealth and power groups will run the country the way they want to. We Peace Corps volunteers are sick at heart."

—From three letters from Americans who saw what happened in the Dominican Republic, as put into the Congressional Record by Senator Morse Dec. 30 pps. 24398-399, along with equally painful letters from Honduras where we also have recognized a new military dictatorship.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Soviet Pact Should Be Supplemented by An Arms Embargo to Disputants

(Continued from Page One)

of China. But if you leave Germany and China out of the picture, if you get the two great Powers to put aside the disputes in which their own allies are involved, it is not hard to see how useful a contribution this new Soviet proposal could make to world peace.

One-Third The Human Race

The two biggest nations on earth, with more than one billion people between them, more than one-third the human race, India and China, have been involved in a bitter and nonsensical border dispute that takes bread from the mouths of their hungry peoples. On the other side of India, its border quarrel with Pakistan over Kashmir keeps more than a half billion human beings in constant hostility. Another hundred million people are involved in the smoldering quarrel among Indonesia, the Philippines and Malaysia over the latter's borders. There may be new trouble this spring between the Arab States and Israel. Africa, from Somalia in the East to Morocco in the West, is girding for war over border troubles. A world agreement to negotiate such disputes, *buttressed by an agreement between Moscow and Washington not to supply arms to either side*—would this not immeasurably contribute to world peace?

A creative diplomacy on our side, really concerned to win battles for peace, could easily take the initiative from the Russians by extending and completing this proposal, first of all in the field of an arms embargo to these quarrelling powers. Russian arms to Egypt and Iraq have greatly increased the danger of war in the explosive Middle East; why not challenge Moscow to a joint agreement which would help to prevent war and force negotiation with Israel in that area? Russian arms to Somalia in its conflict with Kenya and Ethiopia, Russian arms to Indonesia in its quarrel with Malaysia, increase the dangers of new wars spreading out of East Africa and Southeast Asia. But would we be willing to give up the similar leverage for expansion which the Sino-Indian border dispute has given us in India and the Indian Ocean, where Western arms are ending Indian non-alignment, though at the cost of diverting precious resources from the war against India's immemorial hunger to military preparations for war over bleak uninhabitable and never clearly marked borders with Tibet? If we feel this proposal is "non-objective" on Formosa, why not propose that Formosa be included? But are we, then, willing to be objective about Germany? The Oder-Neisse border is not worth a world holocaust. On the other hand, within the terms of the Soviet note, why not negotiate firm access rights to Berlin as a safeguard against indirect border aggression against that free city? There is much that can be done with that note if we really mean business about peace.

One stale State Department objective needs to be nailed down hard. This is its rejoinder that this proposal would still leave the Communists free to wage colonial "wars of liberation." The mythical view that colonial revolts are generated by Moscow has died everywhere else but here. Most of Asia and Africa have been liberated in response to irresistable pressure from its peoples, and only where the Western powers in their folly have tried to hold back the tide have the Communists taken over. Right in the midst of State Department inspired stories on this theme comes the news, for example, that Holden Roberto, the leader of the pro-western faction among the Angolan rebels against Portugal, has turned to Moscow for help in despair over undercover U.S. aid to Portugal (see box above). The way to keep these peoples from falling into Moscow or Peking's sphere of influence is not to force them into it.

Why They Turn to Moscow

"'While paying lip service to self-determination, the U.S. supplies its ally, Portugal, with arms that are used to kill us.' Another example of 'American hypocrisy', Mr. Roberto said, is that G. Mennen Williams, Ass't Secretary of State for African Affairs, tried to convince the Congolese Premier, Cyrille Adoula, not to recognize the Angolan exile government."

—"Angolan Rebels to Take Red Aid", New York Times from Leopoldville, Jan. 4.

Free Copy of Our 1963 Index Now Available If You Send Stamped Self-Addressed Long Envelope—Why Not Keep Issues In A Claw Binder With Index—There's Much In The Weekly You Won't Find Elsewhere

I. F. Stone's Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

1/13/64

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

Newspaper

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except in August at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED